

## OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS TO ADVERTISED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – ANNEX I

<b>Scheme:</b>	<b>BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH COUNCIL (WAITING RESTRICTION AND PERMIT PARKING) ORDER 2014</b>		
	<b>ZONE D</b>		
<b>Date Advertised:</b>	<b>10<sup>th</sup> April 2014</b>	<b>No. of Objections /Comments Received:</b>	<b>3 objections</b>

Objector	Summary of Objection / Comment	Officers Comments	Decision Abandon/Modify/ Proceed as advertised.
Mrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Kelvin Gate	Mrs [REDACTED] states that when she purchased her flat she was only allocated 1 parking space, but as she and her partner have 2 cars they park one in Deepfield Road. She states that parking her 2 <sup>nd</sup> car will become very costly.	The proposal only permits residents of Kelvin Gate to receive visitor permits as this private development has allocated parking within it for its tenants. There are currently 278 properties with Kelvin Gate who could all be experiencing the same issue.	<b>Proceed as advertised</b>
Mrs [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Ian Gibbs Estate Management	<p>Ian Gibbs Estate Management acts as managing agent for the flats at Kelvin Gate in Bracknell. They wrote to inform us that some of their residents had been in contact with them regarding the proposed Residents Parking Scheme, and that the scheme would require permits to be displayed in all vehicles parked in the Deepfield Road area. They were concerned that residents' at Kelvin Gate would not be able to apply for Residents Parking Permits, only Visitors permits.</p> <p>They believed that this may be because the council was under the misapprehension that all of the flats at Kelvin Gate have the benefit of a parking space on-site and informed us that this is not the case. They went on to explain that when the development was built there were insufficient parking spaces to offer one to each private flat. The spaces were allocated on a first-come, first-served basis. They advised that there are ten private flats which do not have a parking space.</p> <p>They therefore requested that at the very least, these flat owners should be entitled to apply for a Residents Parking Permit.</p>	<p>A condition of the Kelvin Gate planning agreement was that the development would not begin until a scheme for managing and controlling the use of the proposed parking areas had been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme needed to take account of the phasing of the development and the relating delivery of parking with occupation. A Parking Management Scheme was submitted to the planning authority in November 2006 which discharged this condition.</p> <p>Therefore, this is fundamentally an issue for the Management Company as it should be providing sufficient parking spaces for all the properties within their development in accordance with their Parking Management Plan produced to meet a Planning requirement.</p>	<b>Proceed as advertised</b>
Mr [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Deepfield Road	<p>Mr [REDACTED] states that there are currently two issues in his road.</p> <p>Firstly the lack of parking spaces near Kelvin Gate because of the double yellow lines that are not really needed. Secondly, Bay Road residents who park "awkwardly" on the adjacent corner because the Council removed all the parking when the traffic calming was installed, which is</p>	The existing waiting restrictions in the vicinity of Kelvin Gate were installed by the Council many years ago to address the issue of obstructive parking on the bend. The introduction of Residents' Parking does not remove the need to prohibit parking where it is considered to introduce a safety issue. Therefore these restrictions should remain.	<b>Proceed as advertised</b>

	<p>totally unnecessary as the parked cars used to calm traffic. He claims that this has recently been exacerbated by the poor siting of a pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] cannot believe that the new shops are not being provided with their own designated staff parking areas at the rear of the premises or in the public car parks.</p> <p>Mr [REDACTED] adds that he hopes that there will be 2 hours free parking for customers.</p>	<p>The junction of Bay Road and Deepfield Road is not included within these proposals and additional restrictions can not be added to this TRO as it would constitute a significant change. This location can therefore be monitored as part of the trial and if considered necessary, additional restrictions advertised at a later date. However, parking in the proximity of a junction in a manner that is obstructing either vehicle movement or visibility is an issue that Thames Valley Police can enforce without the need for restrictions.</p> <p>The request for the restrictions relating to the new shops cannot be considered as part of this Order. Additional restrictions cannot be added after the statutory consultation as they would constitute a significant change. Therefore, this issue, together with any others that may arise, will be monitored throughout the trial period and additional restrictions included within further Orders if considered necessary.</p> <p>.</p>	
--	---	--	--

**Local Member Comments on Consultation responses:**

Cllr R Angell indicated his agreement with the proposals.

No comment was received from Cllr M Sargeant.